UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/829,667	04/22/2004	Arnold Thaler	74104.105017	6830
86528 King & Spaldin	7590 03/28/201 lg LLP	1	EXAM	IINER
401 Congress A Suite 3200	venue		REAGAN, JAMES A	
Austin, TX 787	01		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3621	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/28/2011	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

AustinUSPTO@kslaw.com AustinIP@kslaw.com

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/829,667	THALER, ARNOLD	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	JAMES A. REAGAN	3621	
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet wi	h the correspondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailin earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNION (136(a)). In no event, however, may a rewill apply and will expire SIX (6) MON e, cause the application to become AB	CATION. sply be timely filed THS from the mailing date of this communication. ANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
 1) ■ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 J 2a) ■ This action is FINAL. 2b) ■ This 3) ■ Since this application is in condition for alloware closed in accordance with the practice under It 	s action is non-final. Ince except for formal matt	•	
Disposition of Claims			
4) ☑ Claim(s) 1-20,38-42 and 48-50 is/are pending 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☑ Claim(s) 1-20,38-42 and 48-50 is/are rejected 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	wn from consideration.		
Application Papers			
9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) ☑ The drawing(s) filed on 22 April 2004 is/are: a Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Example 2015.)⊠ accepted or b)□ object drawing(s) be held in abeyand stion is required if the drawing	ce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Burea * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	ts have been received. ts have been received in A prity documents have been u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	oplication No received in this National Stage	
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s	ummary (PTO-413))/Mail Date	
Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6) Other:	formal Patent Application ·	

Art Unit: 3621

DETAILED ACTION

Acknowledgments

- 1. This action is in reply to the RCE, amendment, and response filed on 07/15/2010.
- 2. Claims 1 and 50 have been amended.
- 3. Claims 1-20, 38-42, and 48-50 are currently pending and have been examined.

Art Unit: 3621

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments received 07/15/2010 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Referring to the previous Office action, Examiner has cited relevant portions of the references as a means to illustrate the systems as taught by the prior art. As a means of providing further clarification as to what is taught by the references used in the first Office action, Examiner has expanded the teachings for comprehensibility while maintaining the same grounds

of rejection of the claims, except as noted above in the section labeled "Status of Claims." This

information is intended to assist in illuminating the teachings of the references while providing

evidence that establishes further support for the rejections of the claims.

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims have been considered but are moot in view of the

new ground(s) of rejection.

Art Unit: 3621

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

6. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

7. Claims 1 and 50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for

failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as

the invention.

8. Claims 1 and 50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for

failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as

the invention. The Examiner cannot determine the metes and bounds of the claim because the

claim has been written in the alternative using an "or" statement. For the purposes of this

examination, the Examiner will assume that the claim is a properly written Markush-type

limitation: ...one of the group consisting of [A, B, and C].

Art Unit: 3621

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness

rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as

set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said

subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966),

that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35

U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.

- 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
- 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.

 Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

11. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under

35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was

commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to

the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor

and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was

made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35

U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

12. Claims 1-20, 38-42 and 48-50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Alicot et al. (US 6,429,776 B1), hereinafter ALICOT, in view of Ronchi et al. (USPGP 2002/0077973 A1), hereinafter RONCHI.

Claim 1:

ALICOT as shown below discloses the following limitations:

 a product configured to perform electronic functions, the product having electronic control circuits (see at least abstract; col. 2, lines 20-31);

ALICOT does not disclose the following limitations, but **RONCHI** as shown does:

- a verification and activation module configured to be removably or permanently coupled, or remain removably or permanently coupled, to the electronic control circuits of the product after a purchase of the product; (see at least paragraphs 0003, 0008, 0035)
- wherein the verification and activation module is configured for facilitating the
 activation of the electronic control circuits of the product such that the electronic
 functions of the product become enabled; (see at least paragraph 0008)
- wherein the verification and activation module includes a memory configured to receive and store data during a purchase of the product, such that the data received and stored during the purchase of the product remains removably or permanently stored in the product after the purchase of the product. (see at least paragraph 0014)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine/modify the RFID tag and reader assembly of **ALICOT** with the activations and validation technique of **RONCHI** because In the competitive business climate, there is a profit-driven motive to maximize the profitability of goods and services that are provided or marketed to customers. Enterprises typically use business planning to make decisions in order to maximize profits. Furthermore, "A wireless communication

transponder, for example a radio frequency identification (RFID) tag, can provide the ability to store and update information within an internal storage element and can be associated with a product starting at its manufacturing origins. This transponder can be used and reused throughout manufacturing, distribution and the retail processing of the product. These transponders are already provided with EAS elements, and are further able to store encoded bar code information. At a point of sale (POS), for example, the transponder can be scanned to retrieve the stored information. However, a bar-code scanner can be present, and indeed is likely to be present, which interfaces to the cash register and the retail system. An item or product needs to be scanned by the bar code reader as well, to complete a transaction." (ALICOT: Column 1, lines 20-35)

Claim 2:

The combination of **ALICOT/RONCHI** discloses the limitations as shown in the rejections above. **ALICOT** further discloses the verification and activation module is removably coupled to the product (see at least col. 2, lines 32-55; col. 5, lines 21-41).

Claim 3:

The combination of **ALICOT/RONCHI** discloses the limitations as shown in the rejections above. **ALICOT** further discloses the control circuits of the product are deactivated when the verification and activation module is not coupled to the product (see at least col. 4, lines 13-38).

Claim 4:

The combination of **ALICOT/RONCHI** discloses the limitations as shown in the rejections above. **ALICOT** further discloses the verification and activation module is programmed with information (see at least col. 2, lines 32-55; col. 5, lines 21-41).

Claim 5:

The combination of **ALICOT/RONCHI** discloses the limitations as shown in the rejections above. **ALICOT** further discloses the programmed information comprises purchase date and price of the product (see at least col. 4, lines 1-12).

Claim 6:

The combination of **ALICOT/RONCHI** discloses the limitations as shown in the rejections above. **ALICOT** further discloses the programmed information comprises warranty information for the product (see at least col. 3, lines 21-35; col. 4, lines 1-12).

Claim 7:

The combination of **ALICOT/RONCHI** discloses the limitations as shown in the rejections above. **ALICOT** further discloses the programmed information comprises data about a consumer who purchased the product (see at least abstract).

Claim 8:

The combination of **ALICOT/RONCHI** discloses the limitations as shown in the rejections above. **ALICOT** further discloses the programmed information comprises data about a manufacturer of the product (see at least col. 2, lines 32-55; col. 5, lines 21-41).

Claim 9:

The combination of **ALICOT/RONCHI** discloses the limitations as shown in the rejections above. **ALICOT** further discloses the programmed information comprises data about the product (see at least col. 2, lines 32-55; col. 5, lines 21-41).

Claim 10:

The combination of **ALICOT/RONCHI** discloses the limitations as shown in the rejections above. **ALICOT** further discloses the verification and activation module comprises a non-volatile programmable memory (see at least abstract).

Claim 11:

The combination of **ALICOT/RONCHI** discloses the limitations as shown in the rejections above. **ALICOT** further discloses the non-volatile memory is selected from the group consisting of electrically erasable and programmable read only memory (EEPROM), Flash memory and battery backed-up random access memory (RAM) (see at least abstract; col. 2, lines 32-55).

Claim 12:

The combination of **ALICOT/RONCHI** discloses the limitations as shown in the rejections above. **ALICOT** further discloses the product comprises verification and activation circuits (see at least col. 4, lines 39-55).

Claim 13:

The combination of **ALICOT/RONCHI** discloses the limitations as shown in the rejections above. **ALICOT** further discloses the verification and activation module comprises a non-volatile programmable memory, and verification and activation circuits (see at least col. 4, lines 39-55).

Claim 14:

The combination of **ALICOT/RONCHI** discloses the limitations as shown in the rejections above. **ALICOT** further discloses a security feature that deactivates the product when outside of a geographical location (see at least col. 4, lines 13-38).

Claim 15:

The combination of **ALICOT/RONCHI** discloses the limitations as shown in the rejections above. **ALICOT** further discloses a security feature that deactivates the product when a security signal is not present (see at least col. 4, lines 13-38).

Claim 16:

The combination of **ALICOT/RONCHI** discloses the limitations as shown in the rejections above. **ALICOT** further discloses *warranty history of the product is stored in the non-volatile memory* (see at least col. 3, lines 21-35; col. 4, lines 1-12).

Claim 17:

The combination of **ALICOT/RONCHI** discloses the limitations as shown in the rejections above. **ALICOT** further discloses *repair history of the product is stored in the non-volatile memory* (see at least col. 3, lines 21-35; col. 4, lines 1-12).

Claim 18:

The combination of **ALICOT/RONCHI** discloses the limitations as shown in the rejections above. **ALICOT** further discloses *maintenance history of the product is stored in the non-volatile memory* (see at least abstract; col. 3, lines 21-35; col. 4, lines 1-12).

Claim 19:

The combination of **ALICOT/RONCHI** discloses the limitations as shown in the rejections above. **ALICOT** further discloses a communications interface coupled to the verification and activation module (see at least col. 4, lines 13-38).

Claim 20:

The combination of ALICOT/RONCHI discloses the limitations as shown in the rejections above. ALICOT further discloses the communications interface is selected from the group consisting of WIFI and Bluetooth (see at least col. 5, lines 21-40).

Claim 38:

ALICOT as shown below discloses the following limitations:

a product configured to perform electronic functions, the product having electronic control circuits (see at least abstract; col. 2, lines 20-31); an original product configured for electronic operation (see abstract;

ALICOT does not disclose the following limitations, but **RONCHI** as shown does:

- a verification and activation module coupled to the original product (see at least paragraphs 0003, 0008, 0035)
- a replacement product configured for electronic operation, wherein when the verification and activation module is removed from the original product and coupled to the replacement product, the electronic operation of the replacement product is enabled and the electronic operation of the original product is disabled (see at least paragraphs 0003, 0008, 0033, 0035)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine/modify the RFID tag and reader assembly of ALICOT with the activations and validation technique of RONCHI because In the competitive business climate, there is a profit-driven motive to maximize the profitability of goods and services that are provided or marketed to customers. Enterprises typically use business planning to make decisions in order to maximize profits. Furthermore, "A wireless communication transponder, for example a radio frequency identification (RFID) tag, can provide the ability to store and update information within an internal storage element and can be associated with a product starting at its manufacturing origins. This transponder can be used and reused throughout manufacturing, distribution and the retail processing of the product. These transponders are already provided with EAS elements, and are further able to store encoded bar code information. At a point of sale (POS), for example, the transponder can be scanned to retrieve the stored information. However, a bar-code scanner can be present, and indeed is likely to be present, which interfaces to the cash register and the retail system. An item or product needs to be scanned by the bar code reader as well, to complete a transaction." (ALICOT: Column 1, lines 20-35)

Claim 39:

The combination of **ALICOT/RONCHI** discloses the limitations as shown in the rejections above. **ALICOT** further discloses once the replacement product has been enabled for operation by the verification and activation module, the original product cannot be enabled again by the verification and activation module (see at least col. 2, lines 32-55; col. 5, lines 21-41).

Claim 41:

The combination of **ALICOT/RONCHI** discloses the limitations as shown in the rejections above. **ALICOT** further discloses *the communication is wireless.* (see at least col. 5, lines 21-40).

Claim 42:

The combination of **ALICOT/RONCHI** discloses the limitations as shown in the rejections above. **ALICOT** further discloses the communication is by wire (see col. 2, lines 32-55; col. 5, lines 21-41).

Art Unit: 3621

Claims 40 and 48-50:

The combination of **ALICOT/RONCHI** discloses the limitations as shown in the rejections of the claims above. The Examiner finds that remaining claims 40, and 48-50 are not patentably distinct from claims 1-20, 38, 39, 41, and 42, nor do they produce any new, meaningful, synergetic result that would render the claims novel and therefore, for the sake of clarity, has grouped the rejections of claims 1-20, 38-42 and 48-50 accordingly using the same references and citations as above.

Art Unit: 3621

CONCLUSION

13. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or concerning this

communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to James A.

Reagan (james.reagan@uspto.gov) whose telephone number is 571.272.6710. The Examiner

can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 9:30am-5:00pm. If attempts to reach the examiner

by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, ANDREW J. FISCHER can be

reached at **571.272.6779**.

14. Should Applicant desire in the future to receive formal or informal email communications from the

Examiner (e.g. acknowledgments, references, courtesy copies of documents, etc.), the electronic

file must contain written authorization to conduct email communications. See MPEP §502.03 III.

For Applicant's benefit, exemplary language for written authorization is in MPEP §502.03 III. ¶4.

The exemplary language is:

Recognizing that Internet communications are not secure, I hereby

authorize the USPTO to communicate with me concerning any subject

matter of this application by electronic mail. I understand that a copy of

these communications will be made of record in the application file.

15. In the situation where Applicant desires to receive email communications from the Examiner, the

Examiner suggests placing the above exemplary language in Applicant's next correspondence.

Art Unit: 3621

16. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application

Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be

obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system,

see http://portal.uspto.gov/external/portal/pair . Should you have questions on access to the

Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866.217.9197 (toll-free).

17. Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to 571-273-8300.

18. Hand delivered responses should be brought to the United States Patent and Trademark

Office Customer Service Window:

Randolph Building

401 Dulany Street

Alexandria, VA 22314.

/James A. Reagan/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3621 james.reagan@uspto.gov 571.272.6710 (Office) 571.273.6710 (Desktop Fax)